

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment and reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

The amendments to the claims correct grammatical errors that the applicant was not previously aware of, and those skilled in the art in view of the specification would have understood the claims without the above amendments. The amendments were not statutorily necessary for the allowance of the claims and do not limit the equivalence of the claims.

The above amendment broadens the claims so that the claims cover all equivalents of the elements of the claims.

New claim 14 is allowable because the cited prior art does not suggest that after transmitting a first portion, then transmitting and receiving a second characteristic of a second portion and comparing it to a first characteristic derived from the first portion.

New claim 17 is allowable because the cited prior art does not suggest transmitting apparatus "receiving a characteristic from a second source after the portion of information is transmitted ... and ... determining whether the characteristic is derived from the transmitted portion" as in claim 17.

New claim 19 is allowable because the cited prior art does not suggest a transmitter of information "receiving a first characteristic after a portion of the information is transmitted [and] ... deriving a second characteristic depending on the content of the transmitted portion [and] ... comparing the first characteristic with the second characteristic" as in claim 19.

New claim 21 is allowable because the cited prior art does not suggest "the transmitter includes means for determining whether the

characteristic was derived from the information that was transmitted" as in claim 21.

Regarding the rejections of the claims, applicant respectfully traverses the assertions in the previous office action.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,991,499 to Yagasaki, the citation does not identically disclose each of the elements of the claimed invention.

More specifically with regard to claim 1, the citation does not suggest "information transmitted from the reading device to the application device ... the application device continuously reports back to the reading device a characteristic of the content of the information received by the application device," as in claim 1. There is nothing in the citation indicating that an application sends to a reading device a characteristic of the content of the information received by the application. In Yagaski, the formatter does not send characteristics back to the master disk recorder. Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

More specifically with regard to claim 7, the citation does not suggest "a first characteristic of the content of information transmitted from the reading device and a second characteristic of the content of the information received by the application device after the transmission by the reading device, the second characteristic being received by the reading device, wherein the characteristics are verified by comparison," as in claim 7.

More specifically with regard to claim 8, the citation does not suggest "the reading device comprises means for determining a first characteristic of the content of the transmitted information, wherein the application device comprises means for determining and

transmitting a second characteristic of the content of the information received by the application device, the reading device receiving the transmission of the second characteristic and further include a verifying unit for verifying the characteristics by comparing the first with the second characteristics" as in claim 8.

More specifically with regard to claim 9, the citation does not suggest "a verifying unit for receiving second characteristics of the content of the information received by the application device and continuously reported from the application device to the reading device and for verifying the characteristics by comparing the first and second characteristics" as in claim 9.

More specifically with regard to claim 10, the citation does not suggest "an application report unit for continuously reporting to the reading device a characteristic of the content of the information received by the application report unit [from the reading device]" as in claim 10.

In response to the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), for allegedly being unpatentable over "Name" et. al (US 0,000,000), the rejection should be clarified.

Applicant specifically traverses the official notice which appears to be non-specific and beyond what is well known in the art. The examiner should provide specific references such as college textbooks or handbooks that are familiar to those skilled in the art to establish what is well known in the art. There is nothing in the prior art or what is known in the field that suggests "selection of sectors of information to be summarized is based on the value a SCR-base-field of the sectors."

The claims are definite and distinguished from the citations and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Patent Attorney
(914) 333-9643

S:\BEN17410.AM1.BER.DOC